

Diversion Control Act of 1993 (DCDCA)) to add a requirement that "A regulated person that manufactures a listed chemical shall report annually to the Attorney General, in such form and manner and containing such specific data as the Attorney General shall prescribe by regulation, information concerning listed chemicals manufactured by the person."

5. *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 100 respondents at 1 response per year at 4 hours per response.

6. *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 400 annual burden hours.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: July 11, 1997.

Robert B. Briggs,

Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 97-15720 Filed 6-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S. Revocation of Registration

On June 25, 1996, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S., of California, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not revoke his DEA Certificate of Registration, AA2387721, under 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3), and deny any pending applications for registration pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California.

The Order to Show Cause was not served on Dr. Alhanati until sometime in December 1996. By letter dated December 21, 1996, Dr. Alhanati responded to the Order to Show Cause. In his response, Dr. Alhanati did not request a hearing, but instead set forth his position on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause. Therefore, the Acting Deputy Administrator, finding that Dr. Alhanati has waived his right to a hearing, hereby enters his final order without a hearing and based upon the investigative file and Dr. Alhanati's letter dated December 21, 1996, pursuant to 21 CFR 1301.43 (c) and (e) and 1301.46.

The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that by a decision dated April 17, 1994, the Board of Dental Examiners for the State of California revoked Dr. Alhanati's license to practice medicine based upon a finding that he committed a lewd act upon a child. The Acting Deputy Administrator finds that in light of the fact that Dr. Alhanati is not currently licensed to practice dentistry in the State of California, it is reasonable to infer that he is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in that state.

The DEA does not have statutory authority under the Controlled Substances Act to issue or maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant is without state authority to handle controlled substances in the state in which he conducts his business. 21 U.S.C. 802(21), 823(f) and 824(a)(3). This prerequisite has been consistently upheld. See *Romeo J. Perez, M.D.*, 62 FR 16,193 (1997); *Demetris A. Green, M.D.*, 61 FR 60,728 (1996); *Dominick A. Ricci, M.D.*, 58 FR 51,104 (1993).

Here it is clear that Dr. Alhanati is not currently authorized to handle controlled substances in the State of California. Therefore, Dr. Alhanati is not entitled to a DEA registration in that state.

In his letter dated December 21, 1996, Dr. Alhanati admitted that he was not currently authorized to practice dentistry in California, but stated that he was licensed "in the state of Illinois, among other states." He further contended that "to revoke my DEA Certificate of Registration might forever preclude me from prescribing analgesics requisite following treatment of my patients following surgery." Dr. Alhanati argued that his state license was erroneously revoked because he "was non-culpable of the allegation," and that the reason that it was revoked was non-drug related. Finally, Dr. Alhanati indicated that he was seeking relicensure with the State of California.

The Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that the fact that Dr. Alhanati is licensed to practice dentistry in states other than California is irrelevant since he is not authorized to practice in the state where he is registered with DEA and he has not sought to modify his current registration to another state. The Acting Deputy Administrator notes that revocation of Dr. Alhanati's DEA Certificate of Registration will not forever preclude him from prescribing controlled substances. Dr. Alhanati is certainly free to apply for a new DEA registration in a state where he is authorized to practice dentistry and handle controlled substances or to reapply for a DEA registration in

California, if he is relicensed in that state. The fact that Dr. Alhanati is seeking relicensure in California is not persuasive. There is no evidence in the record that he has been granted a new license to practice dentistry in California, and therefore the Acting Deputy Administrator concludes that Dr. Alhanati is not currently authorized to practice or handle controlled substances in that state. Finally, Dr. Alhanati's arguments that his state revocation was erroneous and not drug-related are immaterial. No matter what the basis was for the state action, the fact remains that he is not currently authorized to practice and handle controlled substances in California.

Accordingly, the Acting Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that DEA Certificate of Registration AA2387721, previously issued to Craig K. Alhanati, D.D.S., be, and it hereby is, revoked. The Acting Deputy Administrator further orders that any pending applications for the renewal of such registration, be, and they hereby are, denied. This order is effective July 16, 1997.

Dated: June 9, 1997.

James S. Milford,

Acting Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-15640 Filed 6-13-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 95-43]

Dennis Robert Howard, M.D. Grant of Restricted Registration

On May 24, 1995, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Dennis Robert Howard, M.D., (Respondent) of Macon, Georgia, notifying him of an opportunity to show cause as to why DEA should not deny his applications for registration as a practitioner under 21 U.S.C. 823(f), for reason that such registration would be inconsistent with the public interest.

By letter dated June 21, 1995, Respondent, through counsel, timely filed a request for a hearing, and following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Atlanta, Georgia on April 23 and 24, 1996, before Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. At the hearing, both parties